

Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON: THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1864.

Weekly National Intelligencer.

By GALE & SEATON.

JAMES C. WELLING, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.
The subscription price of this paper for a year is Two Dollars, payable in advance.

A reduction of 20 per cent. (one-fifth of the full charge) will be made to any one who shall order and pay for, at one time, ten copies of the Weekly paper; and a reduction of 25 per cent. (one-fourth of the full charge) to any one who will order and pay for, at one time, twenty or more copies.

No accounts being kept for this paper, it will not be sent to any one unless paid for in advance, nor any longer than the time for which it is paid.

REVIEW OF MR. SEWARD'S SPEECH.

We yesterday passed before our readers the interesting speech delivered by Mr. Secretary Seward at Auburn on the 3d instant, in congratulation on the recent victories which have crowned our arms, and in exposition of the political issues understood by him to be involved in the pending Presidential contest.

If the speech of the distinguished Premier had been confined to the former of these heads it would have elicited from all loyal citizens, without distinction of party, no other feelings than those which are common to patriotic minds. But when, turning from these aspects of the time which concern the cause of the country, Mr. Seward proceeded to analyze the elements of the political canvass which has just opened, he entered of course upon debatable ground, where he could not expect the concurrence of all classes of his loyal fellow-citizens.

It is not without some surprise that we learn from Mr. Seward that previous to the recent successes the people were "getting a little tired of long delays and disappointed expectations," though we are not at all surprised to learn that the victories of Admiral Farragut in the Bay of Mobile and of Gen. Sherman in the State of Georgia are held to "vindicate the wisdom and the energy of the war administration." And we deem it entirely proper that in a Cabinet not supposed to be remarkable for the unity and harmony of its members the Premier should at least be found willing to pay a tribute of admiration and praise to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War. But when Mr. Seward ventures to say, in homage to the latter, that "he who shall record the history of this war truthfully and impartially will write that since the days of Carnot no man has organized war with ability equal to that of Mr. Stanton," he seems to have forgotten how disagreeable this historical association is known by the country to be in the mind of the present Secretary of War, who, soon after his advent to office, when the New York Tribune praised him in precisely the terms now employed by Mr. Seward, took occasion to repel the doubtful compliment in language highly honorable to his Christian sense of propriety, if not suggesting to military minds the clearest perception of the art of war. We recall the words of Mr. Stanton on this occasion, written immediately after the fall of Forts Henry and Donelson in the winter of 1862, that those who wish to pay him the tribute due to his talents may not fall into the error of reviving in connection with his name a style of speech which he hears not only with apprehension but with disgust, inspired by its currency in "infidel France" during the stormy days which followed the French Revolution. In the letter to which we refer Mr. Stanton wrote:

"I cannot suffer undue merit to be ascribed to my official action. The glory of our recent victories belongs to the gallant officers and soldiers that fought the battles. No share of it belongs to me."
"Much has recently been said of military combinations and organizing victory. I hear such phrases with apprehension. They commenced in infidel France with the Union campaign, and resulted in Waterloo. Who can organize victory? Who can combine the elements of success on the battlefield? We owe our recent victories to the Spirit of the Lord, that moved our soldiers to rush into battle, and filled the hearts of our enemies with terror and dismay. The inspiration that conquered in battle was in the hearts of the soldiers, and from on high; and wherever there is the same inspiration there will be the same results. Patriotic spirit, with resolute courage in officers and men is a military combination that need fear nothing."
"We may well rejoice at the recent victories, for they teach us that battles are to be won now and by us in the same and only manner that they were ever won by any people or in any age since the days of Joshua—by boldly pursuing and striking the foe. What, under the blessing of Providence, I am proud to say, we have accomplished in the military and military combination to end this war was declared in a few words by Gen. Grant's message to Gen. Buckner: 'I propose to move immediately on your works.'"

It will thus be seen that the "art of war," as Mr. Stanton understands it, is so exceedingly simple that it does not leave any room for "military combinations" or for "organizing victory," in the ordinary sense of those terms. "The true organization of victory and military combination to end this war," as he conceives, was declared in the few words of Gen. Grant to Gen. Buckner: "I propose to move immediately on your works!" Advancing from these preliminary topics to the more essential themes of his discourse, the distinguished Secretary then proceeds to define the different classes of people who, in the present crisis, look some of the elements of a genuine patriotism. He says:

"Some are Republicans, who cannot rejoice in the national victories because this war for the life of the nation is not in all respects conducted according to their peculiar radical ideas and theories. They want guarantees for swift and universal and complete emancipation, or they do not want the nation saved. Others stay away because they want to be assured that in coming out of the revolutionary storm the ship of state will be found exactly in the same condition as when the tempest assailed it, or they do not want the ship saved at all, as if any body could give such guarantees in the same of a people of thirty millions. Others are Democrats. They received from their fathers the axiom that only Democrats could save the country, and they must save it by Democratic formulas and combinations which the progress of the age has forever exploded. They cannot come up to celebrate achievements which condemn their narrow and hereditary bigotry. Others, of both the Republican and Democratic parties, are willing that the nation shall be saved, provided it is done by some one of their chosen and idolized chiefs, which chief they mutually denounce and revile. They cannot honor Grant, and Sherman, and Farragut, and Porter, because by such homage they fear that Fremont and McClellan's name may be eclipsed."

We think it will be admitted by all candid minds that Mr. Seward is very equal and impartial in the distribution of his censure. Indeed, he places in the fore front, as the first objects of his condemnation,

those of his own party who are carried away by their "peculiar radical ideas and theories" in regard to emancipation, which they want to see "swift, universal, and complete," more than they want to see the nation saved. It is well known to the country that this is no new opinion of the Secretary. We know from his published despatches that prior to the utterance of the preliminary emancipation edict of September 22, 1862, he imputed to this class of men a zeal which made them auxiliary to the armed insurgents, as the impracticable fanaticism of the former, by the embarrassment they caused the Administration, conspired to promote the designs of the latter. And since the evil day when the Administration, by yielding to what the President called "the Greeley faction," was weak enough to repeat the folly of the reluctant maiden who married the importunate suitor to get rid of him, it has known no embarrassment equal to that which gave it so much trouble before the surrender was made. The Secretary of State has a right to speak with full knowledge on this subject, for it was the exaction and importunity of this class, as represented in the Senate of the United States, which compelled him at one time to resign the trust he holds from the President, and no fidelity in the performance of whose duties has been found from that day to this sufficient to appease the hostility of this dominating faction. Those who give to the Secretary the honor that is due to him for his conduct of our foreign affairs during the last three years and longer, are perhaps the more reconciled to a change of Administration on the 4th of March next, as after that period they have no hope or expectation that those members of the Cabinet who have given it some character for conservatism, and who for this reason have provoked the hostility of the dominant faction in the Republican party, will be allowed to remain in the places which they now fill.

If there be any Democrats (and we presume there are such) who, in their devotion to "Democratic formulas and combinations," are as blind to the higher interests of the country as the Republicans whom Mr. Seward rebukes for their bigoted addition to their "radical ideas and theories," we join him as cordially in the condemnation of the one as of the other, though with him we give the first place to those who have had the opportunity as they have shown the ability and will to do the greater mischief. We still belong to that class of Union men who, in the words of the Secretary, "found out at the beginning of this tremendous civil war that no man, no party, no formula, no creed could save the Union, but that only the people could save it, and they could save it only by ceasing to become partisans and becoming patriots and Union men." And if the present Administration had continued to be of this class we should have been as zealous in its support to-day as we were at the beginning of this tremendous civil war.

There has been much debate in the halls of Congress, in our State papers, and in the public press with regard to the real and true object of this "tremendous civil war." Mr. Seward gives us a new definition in the following words:

"The war is maintained on our side to suppress the usurper, and to bring the insurgent States back under the authority of the constitutional President. The war is at its crisis. It is clear, therefore, that we are fighting to make Abraham Lincoln President of the whole United States, under the election of 1860, to continue until the 4th of March, 1865. In voting for a President of the United States, we can wisely or safely vote out the identical person whom with force and arms we are fighting into the Presidency!"

This, to say the least, is a very extraordinary statement. We are informed that the vast array of strength which the nation has put forth during the last three years and more, the treasure it has expended, and the blood it has shed, have all been enlisted in the interest of one man, and are all to ensure to his personal benefit, by a supposititious right of office inhering in him beyond the term for which he was elected. In other words, the crimes of the insurgents and their contumacy in rebellion are made the political stock in trade on which Mr. Seward claims for Mr. Lincoln an extension of his official term. Or, to state the same proposition as viewed from the north side of the dividing line between the insurgent and the loyal States, the unsuccessfulness of the Administration in quelling the rebellion, after, by its own admission, ample means had been placed in its hands for long ago accomplishing this just expectation of the country, is made the pretext for asking that it should be entrusted for another four years with the command of the resources it has shown itself so little qualified to use with advantage. To admit the novel doctrine of Presidential succession thus ingeniously propounded by Mr. Seward is, we respectfully submit, to offer a premium to Executive imbecility, as it makes the inefficiency of the Administration for one term the ground of its claim to be employed for a second term.

If Mr. Seward had not on a former occasion based the right of Mr. Lincoln to be re-nominated at Baltimore on the same ground on which he now bases the right of Mr. Lincoln to be re-elected for another term, we might have supposed that this species of argument was nothing more than a pleasant conceit of the imagination; for we are sure that it will strike plain minds as being more metaphysical than real; and when it is the best thing that such an enlightened statesman as Mr. Seward can advance in favor of the re-election of Mr. Lincoln, every body can easily perceive that there must be a lamentable poverty of substantial reasons to urge in support of a cause which compels its advocates to have recourse to such imaginary and fanciful arguments, based on an assumed "Divine right" of a man who has been elected President of the United States for four years to be elected for four years more, in case he has not elected *de facto* in the former period all the privileges to which he was originally entitled *de jure*.

But suppose we admit that there is something substantial in Mr. Seward's argument under this head. What follows? Why simply this, that it does not lie in his mouth to address any plea on this ground to his fellow-citizens in behalf of Mr. Lincoln, because the party for whom he speaks was the first to show its contempt of this theory. Mr. Hamlin, as Vice President of the United States, was elected to preside over the Senate of the whole United States. Not having had the privilege of doing so from the prevalence of armed treason in the land, he was entitled, according to the logic of Mr. Seward, to be elected for a second term quite as much as Mr. Lincoln. But the Baltimore Convention in his person expressed its utter disregard of this doctrine, though previously made aware of its existence by the public declarations of Mr. Seward. When, therefore, Mr. Seward ventures to press this doctrine into the support of Mr. Lincoln, he should address himself to those who have been the first to flout it, to wit, the Republican party. If the doctrine is purely visionary, the less that is said about it the better. If it is substantial and sound, it has already been gratuitously trampled under foot by Mr. Seward's political friends, and one would suppose that the anxiety he betrays on this subject might be more properly directed to those who were first in the transgression. And this is all we think that need be said on this topic.

In another portion of his speech Mr. Seward, speaking in the same sense, says:

"Nothing is more certain than that either the United States and their constitutional President, or the so-called Confederate States and their usurping President, must rule within the limits of this Republic. I therefore regard the pending Presidential election as involving the question whether hereafter we shall have a Constitution and a country left us. How shall we vote, then, to save our country from this fearful danger?"

That is, either Jefferson Davis or Abraham Lincoln must rule over the territory of the United States, and this is the question at issue in the pending election. As nobody who knows Gen. McClellan will suspect him of yielding the supremacy of the constitutional government of the United States to the usurping sway of Gen. Jefferson Davis, we were at some loss to apprehend the force of this language until we found the possible explanation of it in the following significant intimations made by Mr. Seward in another part of his speech. Referring to the contingent success of Gen. McClellan, and to the prospect, in that event, of a Convention being invited for the settlement of our troubles, he said:

"What, now, if there be no Convention at all, or if the Convention fail to agree on a submission to the Federal authority? Jefferson Davis then remains in authority, his Co-seditionary established, and the Union, with all its glories, is gone forever. Nay, more, if such a thing could happen as that the Chicago candidate, nominated upon such an agreement, should be elected President of the United States on the first day of November next, who can vouch for the safety of the country against the rebels during the interval which must elapse before the new Administration can constitutionally come into power? It seems to me that such an election would tend equally to demoralize the Union and to invite the insurgents to renew their efforts for its destruction."

Aye, we ask with Mr. Seward, "who can vouch for the safety of the country against the rebels during the interval which must elapse before the new Administration can constitutionally come into power?" It the present Administration were loyal and patriotically devoted to the Union and the Constitution, if it would be expected to have that respect for the popular will in the event of its defeat which it will ask at the hands of its opponents in the event of its success, there would be no need of "vouchers" for the "safety" of the country against the rebels during the interval specified." But as Mr. Seward admits that there may well arise a question on that point, we leave it for him to answer the question which he has propounded, as it is one which solely concerns the honor and integrity and capacity of the Administration, and cannot be allowed to control the minds of the American people in the exercise of their elective franchise. It is indeed conceivable that the Administration, in the event of its defeat, stung with rage and mortification, might conclude a hasty and disgraceful peace with the insurgents, in the fear that its successors in office might win for themselves the honor of restoring peace and union under the Constitution, but, though Mr. Seward suggests to the minds of the people a question on this point, we must refuse to believe in the possibility of such a tremendous and premeditated act of treachery on its part. If indeed it be open to the suspicion of such an astounding breach of public faith, it would be with all patriotic people only an additional reason for ejecting it from the trust which, on this supposition, it would have already betrayed in its heart. And the very discussion of such a question is so derogatory to the honor of the Administration that we wonder that so prudent and cautious a statesman as the Secretary of State should have started any question in the minds of the people on this point. And, whatever question there may be in the minds of any, after this untoward intimation, we do not doubt that Mr. Lincoln, in case his rival should be constitutionally elected, will resign his high prerogatives into that rival's hands, and we would find hope that he loves his country so much better than himself that he could sincerely wish his rival to be more successful than he has been in promoting the honor, peace, dignity, and unity of the nation.

A single topic more, and we dismiss this review of the Secretary's argument. It will be seen that though confessing himself "altogether unauthorized to speak for the President upon hypothetical questions, he thinks he can give an answer upon the subject of slavery at the present day—an answer which will be explicit, and he hopes not altogether unsatisfactory." That answer is as follows:

"When the insurgents shall have disbanded their armies and laid down their arms the war will instantly cease; and all war measures then existing, including those which affect slavery, will cease also, and all the moral, economical, and political questions, as well as questions affecting slavery as others, which shall then be existing between individuals and States and the Federal Government, whether they arose before the civil war began or whether they

grew out of it, will, by force of the Constitution, pass over to the arbitrament of courts of law and to the councils of legislation."

This answer, though "altogether unauthorized," might be satisfactory to us and to the people who think with us, if we did not happen to have the declaration of another Cabinet officer (and that too of one popularly supposed to be not the least in the confidence of Mr. Lincoln) who has publicly affirmed that this question is not to be remitted to the "councils of law or the councils of legislation." We allude to the Postmaster General, who, in a speech made at Cleveland during last year, held the following language:

"The people once slaves in the rebel States can never again be recognized as such by the United States. No JUDICIAL DECISION, NO LEGISLATIVE ACTION, STATE OR NATIONAL, can be admitted to re-enslave a people who are associated with our own destinies in this war of defense to save the Government, and whose manumission was deemed essential to the restoration and preservation of the Union, and to its permanent peace."

Where members of the same official household speak such a various language, where the one affirms what the other denies, there can of course be no foundation for public confidence in personal declarations on this score. We are left to grope our way towards the truth as best we may, when the one who should be our guides simply darkens counsel by the multiplication of words that bring no assured knowledge. But the mere existence of such positive contradiction in the same body argues a fatal want of unity in its members, springing, as we are willing to believe, from the want of any logical system of constitutional ideas in the conduct of the Government, for, if this explanation be not accepted in charity, it only remains to suppose that such ambiguities of speech are part of a deliberate system to plaiter with the people by the use of words in a double sense—a resort which, however common among inferior politicians, is altogether inconceivable in the case of officers removed alike by the purity of their characters and by the elevation of their position above the suspicion of engaging in such an easily detected species of jugglery. When such men hold a different language with regard to the same policy we may be sure it is the fault of the policy itself, and is not the offspring of duplicity. It only remains for us to say that in his Niagara manifesto the President has himself "defined his position" on this question in terms which leave no room for misapprehension on the part of any who do not wish to be deceived, and which render us quite independent of the glosses furnished by commentators inside or outside of the Cabinet.

AN ACCESSION TO THE ADMINISTRATION.

The New York Tribune, which in the winter of 1860-'61 pledged itself to do the best it could "to forward the views" of the disaffected people of the Seceded States, announces in its number of the 5th instant that it will hereafter "fly the banner of Abraham Lincoln for the next Presidency." The paper has for some time been wavering between secret dislike and open hostility to the Administration, but it now boldly "forwards the views" of the insurgents by committing itself to the support of Mr. Lincoln after this fashion:

"We might, indeed, have a better Administration; we might have one, on the other hand, a thousand times worse. We should have a worse before we have a better. But it is too late now to take a new departure. We must accept the situation with all its difficulties. If the Administration wants vigor, give it vigor; if it wants earnestness, give it earnestness; if it wants understanding, give it understanding. Infuse it with a people's will; infuse it with a people's courage; reinforce it with a people's confidence; overwhelm it with a people's determination that treason and slavery shall never prevail against them, but that both shall be trampled under their feet. But never desert it. Never let its short comings, its weaknesses, its short sightedness, and its delays defeat it. God knows it might have done better; God alone knows how much worse it might have done."

It will be seen that the Tribune, true to the conception it has long entertained, and to the theory on which it has habitually practised in dealing with the Administration, proposes in the future, as in the past, to treat it as an organ that can be whistled through according to the will of those who blow the bellows and manipulate the keys. If the Administration wants vigor, the Tribune proposes to "give it vigor;" if it wants earnestness, the Tribune proposes to "give it earnestness;" and if it wants understanding, the Tribune proposes to "give it understanding." And that it does want all these is frankly admitted, when, accepting "the situation with all its difficulties," our radical contemporary adjures its political friends not to let the "short-comings," "weaknesses," "short-sightedness," and "delays" of the Administration be the means of defeating the party. Surely Mr. Lincoln is to be congratulated on the support of the "Greeley faction," as he calls it—a support purchased by a forfeiture of the confidence which sober men of all parties once reposed in his steadfastness and independence, but which they repose no longer, and which they will never be likely to repose so long as the Tribune avows its purpose to give to his Administration the requisite "vigor," "earnestness," and "understanding."

NOMINATION IN MICHIGAN.

The Democracy of Michigan have nominated the Hon. WM. M. FENTON as the candidate for Governor of that State. He has already served his State as Lieutenant Governor and State Senator. He was Colonel of the Eighth Michigan Regiment of volunteers, which saw, perhaps, as much hard service as any volunteer regiment in the service. Continued ill health, arising from disease contracted in service, compelled his retirement from the field, but wherever he is his patriotism, his sterling ability, and excellent sense and sound judgment will always be exercised in behalf of his country—Post.

THE DRAFT.

Secretary Stanton announces in an official bulletin that the draft for the deficiency in the districts that have not filled their quotas is ordered to proceed without delay, beginning with those most in arrears. The Provost Marshal General's office is now busily engaged in preparing for it. Payment of bounties to recruits authorized by the act of July last did not cease on the 5th instant, but is still continued as they were before that day, and volunteers will be counted on the quotas up to the latest possible moment.

THE DUTCH GAP CANAL.

A letter dated at Gen. Butler's Headquarters on the 5th instant states that the Dutch Gap canal—as a canal—is so far completed that its success is beyond question. The river will be taught a new and better channel, and commerce will be forever facilitated. But (the writer adds) of "how much use as a military expedient the canal may be, remains to be seen. It will by no means open the river to Richmond. The rebel gunboats are now a mile or two above it. Fort Drury is above it, and there may be obstructions in the channel above it. However, by means of it, we shall flank Howlett House battery, which is almost as formidable as Drury's Bluff, and shall cut off six miles of river."

THE PRESIDENCY.

The Committee appointed by the Chicago Convention to notify Gen. McClellan of his nomination for the Presidency met at 10 o'clock on Thursday morning at the St. Nicholas Hotel, New York, and, after a social interchange of feeling, the committee left the hotel and proceeded to the city residence of Gen. McClellan, where, after the ceremony of introduction and a brief interview, the committee presented to Gen. McClellan a copy of the proceedings of the Chicago Convention and a letter advising him of his nomination. The letter is said to have been penned by Gov. Seymour, and is as follows:

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 8, 1864.
Major General GEORGE B. McCLELLAN.

SIR: The undersigned were appointed a committee by the National Democratic Convention, which met at Chicago on the 29th of August, to advise you of your unanimous nomination by that body as the candidate of the Democratic party for President of the United States, and also to present you a copy of the proceedings and resolutions of the Convention.

It gives me great pleasure to perform this duty and to act as the representatives of that Convention, whose deliberations were witnessed by a vast assemblage of citizens, who attended and watched its proceedings with intense interest.

We are assured that those for whom we speak were animated with the most earnest, devoted, and prayerful desire for the salvation of the American Union and the preservation of the Constitution of the United States; and that the accomplishment of these objects was the guiding and impelling motive in every step of their proceedings.

We have the honor to be, your obedient servants,
HORATIO SEYMOUR, Chairman.

Alfred P. Edwards, Ind. John Bigler, Cal.
John Merritt, Del. Isaac Lawrence, R. I.
Joseph E. Smith, Maine. Hugh McCurdy, Mich.
Benjamin Stark, Oregon. G. George H. Carman, Md.
Charles Nugent, Iowa. John M. Douglas, Ill.
William Blannin, Kansas. John D. Starnes, Penn.
A. H. Berry, Minn. J. G. Abbott, Mass.
Charles A. Wickliffe, Ky. James Guthrie, Ky.
Geo. W. Morgan, Ohio. C. G. W. Harrington, N. H.
Geo. Renshaw, N. J. Alfred E. Burdett, Conn.
John A. Green, Jr., N. Y. Walter F. Burch, Missouri.
John Cunn, Vermont. W. T. Galloway, Wis.

After a pleasant interchange of compliments the Committee retired.

GEN. McCLELLAN'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

ORANGE, N. J., SEPTEMBER 8, 1864.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter informing me of my nomination by the Democratic National Convention, recently assembled at Chicago, as their candidate at the next election for President of the United States.

It is unnecessary for me to say to you that this nomination comes to me unthought. I am happy to know that when the nomination was made the record of my public life was kept in view.

The effect of long and varied service in the army during war and peace has been to strengthen and make indelible in my mind and heart the love and reverence for the Union, Constitution, Laws, and Flag of our Country impressed upon me in early youth. These feelings have thus far guided the course of my life, and make me anxious to do so in the future.

The existence of more than one Government over the people, the power, and the happiness of the people.

The preservation of our Union was the avowed object for which the war was commenced. It should have been conducted for that object only, and in accordance with those principles which I took occasion to declare when in active service. Thus conducted, the work of reconciliation would have been easy, and we might have respected the benefits of our many victories on land and sea.

The Union was originally formed by the exercise of a spirit of conciliation and compromise. To restore and preserve it the same spirit must prevail in our councils and in the hearts of the people. The re-establishment of the Union in all its integrity is and must continue to be the indispensable condition in any settlement.

As soon as it is clear, or even probable, that our present adversaries are ready for peace upon the basis of the Union, we should exhaust all the resources of statesmanship, practised by civilized nations and taught by the traditions of the American people, consistent with the honor and interests of the country, to secure such peace, re-establish the Union, and give sanction for the future to the constitutional rights of every State. The Union is the one condition of peace—we can ask no more.

Let me add, what I doubt not was, although unexpressed, the sentiment of the Convention, as it is of the people they represent, that when any one State is willing to return to the Union it should be received at once with a full guarantee of all its constitutional rights.

If a frank, earnest, and persistent effort to obtain these objects should fail, the responsibility for ulterior consequences will fall upon those who remain in arms against the Union.

But the Union must be preserved at all hazards. I could not look in the face my gallant comrades of the army and navy, who have survived so many bloody battles, and tell them that their labors and the sacrifice of so many of our slain and wounded brethren had been in vain—that we had abandoned that Union for which we had so often perilled our lives. A vast majority of our people, whether in the army and navy or at home, would, as I would, hold with unbounded joy the permanent restoration of peace on the basis of Union under the Constitution without the effusion of another drop of blood; but no peace can be permanent without Union.

As to the other subjects presented in the resolutions of the Convention, I need only say that I should seek in accordance therewith, the rule of my duty and the limitations of executive power, endeavor to restore economy in public expenditure, re-establish the supremacy of law, and by the operation of a more vigorous nationality, resume our commanding position among the nations of the earth.

The condition of our finances, the depreciation of the paper money, and the burdens thereby imposed on labor and capital, show the necessity of a return to a sound financial system, while the rights of citizens and the rights of States, and the binding authority of law over President, army, and people, are subjects of not less vital importance in war than in peace.

Believing that the views here expressed are those of the Convention and the people you represent, I accept the nomination. I realize the weight of the responsibility to be borne, should the people ratify my choice.

Conscious of my own weakness, I can only seek fortification by the guidance of the Ruler of the Universe, and, relying on His all-powerful aid, do my best to restore union and peace to a suffering people, and to establish and guard their liberties and rights.

I am, gentlemen, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
GEORGE B. McCLELLAN.

Hon. HORATIO SEYMOUR and others, Committee.

CHICAGO CONVENTION.

Reply of Mr. C. W. Carrigan, of Pennsylvania, to the strictures of Mr. Harris, of Maryland, and Mr. Long, of Ohio.

MR. PRESIDENT: I desire, in answer to the strictures of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Harris) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long), that Gen. George B. McClellan should speak for himself. Although written

more than two years since—and constituting a portion of the record he makes against the efforts of the present Administration to change a war inaugurated for the maintenance of the Union and the preservation of the Constitution into an abolition crusade—it is fully applicable to the aspirations of to-day. He is charged with collusion with President Lincoln in relation to the proclamation of emancipation. No charge could be more unjust and so utterly at variance with his well-known and oft-repeated sentiments. Sir, he completely vindicates himself in a letter to Gen. A. E. Burnside, written January 7, 1862, in which he says:

"I would urge great caution in relation to proclamations. In no case would I go beyond a moderate joint proclamation with the naval commander, which should say as little as possible about politics or the negro; merely state that the true issue for which we are fighting is the preservation of the Union and upholding the laws of the General Government, and stating that all who conduct themselves properly will, as far as possible, be protected in their persons and property."

Sir, is this an endorsement of the President's emancipation proclamation? Is this collusion with unconstitutional declaration? Is it not rather an unequivocal condemnation? "Say as little as possible about politics and the negro," but every thing, and in a determined spirit, about the Union—the integrity of the Government and the protection of persons and property. How unlike this written record are the charges made here to-day! [Great cheering.]

Again, in a letter to Major Gen. Halleck, commanding the Department of Missouri, written November 11, 1861, he says:

"In regard to the particular conduct of affairs, you will please labor to impress on the inhabitants of Missouri and the State that we are fighting solely for the integrity of the Union, to uphold the power of our National Government, and to restore to the nation the blessings of peace and good order."

Do these instructions to Gen. Halleck sustain the unscrupulous assertions of the gentleman from Ohio, that George B. McClellan violated "the freedom of elections and rights of citizens?" On the contrary, sir, does he not absolutely divorce from the "conduct of the war" such outrages upon the liberties of the people? Impressed with the solemnity of his mission, and the patriotic impulses of the gallant men he commanded, he pleads "solely for the integrity of the Union, the power of our National Government, and the blessings of peace and good order."

No purer sentiments or more exalted conception of duty ever animated the head or heart of a military chieftain.

In his instructions to Brig Gen. Buell, commanding the Department of the Ohio, written November 7, 1861, he says:

"It is possible that the conduct of our political affairs of Kentucky is more important than that of our military operations. I certainly cannot over-estimate the importance of the former. You will please constantly to bear in mind the precise issue for which we are fighting; that issue is the preservation of the Union and the restoration of the full authority of the General Government over all portions of our territory. We shall most gladly support the rebellion and restore the authority of the Government by religiously respecting the constitutional rights of all."

Then, sir, as if he had not impressed Gen. Buell as strongly as he desired with the importance of the work before him—weighed down with the responsibilities attaching to the proper conduct of this fearful struggle—desiring to avoid all unnecessary arrests, and to protect to the utmost verge the liberties of the citizens, he again, on November 12, 1861, thus writes to Gen. Buell:

"In regard to political matters, bear in mind that we are fighting only to preserve the integrity of the Union, and to uphold the power of the General Government. As far as military necessity will permit, religiously respect the constitutional rights of all. Preserve the strictest discipline among the troops, and while employing the utmost energy in military movements, be careful to treat the unarmed inhabitants as to enemies, not widens, the breach exist between us and the rebels. . . . I mean by this, that it is the desire of the Government to avoid unnecessary irritation by careless arrests and pre-emptory individualities. . . . I have always found this to be the tendency of subordinates to make vexatious arrests on mere suspicion. . . . It should be our constant aim to make it apparent to all that their property, their comfort, and their personal safety will be best preserved by adhering to the Union."

Sir, is there any thing in these instructions to Gen. Buell, (who, for faithful compliance with said instructions, was compelled to resign, or submit to dishonor at the hands of this Administration)—I repeat, sir, is there any thing in these instructions to warrant the charge of the gentleman from Maryland, that Gen. George B. McClellan was "an assassin of State rights?" Sir, this Convention was "an assassin of State rights" from Maryland and the country will hold the gentlemen from Maryland responsible for this slander, while by the action of the one and the votes of the other, in the nomination and triumphant election, his vindication will be complete. [Cheers.]

One more allusion to the consistent record of George B. McClellan, and I have done. In that statesmanlike compendium of what should be the objects of the war, as he understood it, written ten days after he had declared to Secretary Stanton, with an almost broken heart, but with unflinching faith in his mission: "I take this army now, I tell you plainly that I owe no thanks to you or any other persons in Washington. You have done your best to sacrifice this army." In that remarkable letter, written in camp near Harrison's Landing, July 7th, 1862, with the enemy in front in overwhelming numbers, he, for the last time, endeavors to impress the President of the United States with the true issues of the war, while in unmistakable language he declares:

"Neither confiscation of property, political executions of persons, territorial organizations of States, nor forcible abolition of slavery should be contemplated for a moment. . . . Military arrests should not be tolerated except in places where active hostilities exist; and, outside, not required by enactments, constitutionally made, should neither be demanded nor received."

Then, sir, with a solemnity that can be felt, and in language grandly awful, he concludes: "I MAY BE ON THE BRINK OF ETERNITY; AND AS I HOPE FOR FORGIVENESS FROM MY MAKER, I HAVE WRITTEN THIS LETTER WITH SINCERITY TOWARDS YOU AND FROM LOVE OF MY COUNTRY." [Great cheers.]

General George B. McClellan in these letters speaks for himself. Here is his vindication from the assaults of the gentlemen from Ohio and Maryland. With the tenderness of Washington, the consistency of Jefferson, and the firmness of Jackson, he asserts, and at all times endeavored to maintain the Union and the Constitution with the reservations of the one and the guarantees of the other. Toward the people of Maryland and North Carolina he at all times evinced the most anxious solicitude for the protection of their persons and property. Despite the vindictive assaults here indulged in, George B. McClellan, to-day, is as deeply and firmly imbedded in the hearts of the American people as the granite in the mountains and the iron in the ore beds of his native Pennsylvania. [Loud and enthusiastic applause.]